

b4 and

chamber to be filled also has at least one filling tube (5, 6), which is disposed in the seam of the outer border zone (2, 3).

12

13. (New) The multichamber bag according to Claim 8, characterized in that in addition to the discharge tube (4) each chamber to be filled also has at least one filling tube (5, 6), which is disposed in the seam of the outer border zone (2, 3).

b5

13

14. (New) The multichamber bag according to Claim 9, characterized in that in addition to the discharge tube (4) each chamber to be filled also has at least one filling tube (5, 6), which is disposed in the seam of the outer border zone (2, 3).

REMARKS

The claims have been amended to address the various objections.

Applicants believe these new claims overcome the objection by the Examiner. The Examiner objected to "the ... outer layers" having insufficient antecedent basis. Applicant has deleted this limitation from claim 1. Additionally, all parenthetical expressions cited in claim 1 have been omitted.

Claim 4 has been deleted and in claim 4 the wording "may also have" has been replaced with the word "contains."

Regarding Examiner's objections regarding novelty and inventive step in view of the cited three European patent applications applicant comments are as follows:

The first cited application EP 0 345 (EP'774), item 10 of the Office Action, deals with a multilayer heat-sealable polymer film having hermetic seals as

REMARKS

As an initial matter, a minor error in the specification has been corrected, regarding the unit N of the force to separate the seam between the two chambers 8 and 9. The correct unit is N/mm². At page 13, lines 12 to 15, it is mentioned that the force is determined according to DIN 53 457. The unit of the measured tensile strength is N/mm² and not N. As evidence, enclosed is an extract of an article from Ullmann's Encyclopedia of Industrial Chemistry, "Plastics, Properties and Testing." Please consider reference [91], which depicts DIN 53 457.

The rejection of claim 12 has been addressed by canceling that claim and substituting claim 15. It is self evident that mixing of the two solutions which are filled in the two chambers is achieved by opening the separable seam. See page 5, line 30 to page 6, line 5.

The rejection of claims 1-6 as anticipated by or obvious over Gajewski et al is respectfully traversed. The claims have been drawn to a method of sealing, which overcomes the rejection. None of the references suggests such a method. Support for the amendment can be found, for example, on page 13, line 32 to page 14, line 2.

Claim 7 has been formulated as independent. Although there are now article and method of manufacture claims, the method is closely related to a multichamber bags of the article claims and the method of claim 1 is the only way of manufacturing a bag according to amended claim 7 and manufacturing a bag according to the present invention is the most preferred application of the method. Therefore, there is no basis for restriction since only one invention is claimed.

It is believed that all the claims are in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert Berliner
(Registration No. 20,121)
Attorney for Applicants

Phone: 213-892-9200
Fax: 213-680-4518